

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST	1
II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES	1
III. STATUS OF CLAIMS.....	2
IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS	2
V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER.....	2
VI. ISSUES TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL.....	3
VII. THE ARGUMENT	4
VIII. CLAIMS APPENDIX	14
IX. EVIDENCE APPENDIX	23
X. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX	23

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

In re Application of	:	Customer Number: 46320
	:	
Christopher GAGE, et al.	:	Confirmation Number: 8638
	:	
Application No.: 09/557,708	:	Group Art Unit: 2141
	:	
Filed: April 25, 2000	:	Examiner: A. Baugh
	:	
For: URL BASED STICKY ROUTING TOKENS USING A SERVER SIDE COOKIE JAR		

TRANSMITTAL OF SUPPLEMENTAL APPEAL BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

Submitted herewith is Appellants' Supplemental Appeal Brief, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 41.39(b)(2), in support of the Appeal Brief filed September 19, 2005, and in response to the Examiner reopening prosecution in the Office Action dated April 12, 2006, in which a 3 month period to reply was set.

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17, 41.20, and in connection with the filing of this paper, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 09-0461, and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Date: July 12, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Scott D. Paul

Scott D. Paul
Registration No. 42,984
Steven M. Greenberg
Registration No. 44,725
CUSTOMER NUMBER 46320

**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE
BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES**

In re Application of	:	Customer Number: 46320
	:	
Christopher GAGE, et al.	:	Confirmation Number: 8638
	:	
Application No.: 09/557,708	:	Group Art Unit: 2141
	:	
Filed: April 25, 2000	:	Examiner: A. Baugh
	:	
For: URL BASED STICKY ROUTING TOKENS USING A SERVER SIDE COOKIE JAR	:	

SUPPLEMENTAL APPEAL BRIEF

Mail Stop Appeal Brief - Patents
Commissioner for Patents
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Sir:

This Supplemental Appeal Brief is submitted, pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 41.39(b)(2), in support of the Appeal Brief filed September 19, 2005, and in response to the Examiner reopening prosecution in the Office Action dated April 12, 2006, wherein Appellants appeal from the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-27.

I. REAL PARTY IN INTEREST

This application is assigned to IBM Corporation by assignment recorded on August 22, 2000, at Reel 011152, Frame 0250.

II. RELATED APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

Appellants are unaware of any related appeals and interferences.

III. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-27 are pending and finally rejected in this Application. It is from the final rejection of claims 1-27 that this Appeal is taken.

IV. STATUS OF AMENDMENTS

The claims have not been amended subsequent to the imposition of the Final Office Action dated March 18, 2005, or the reopening of prosecution by the Examiner in the Office Action dated April 12, 2006. Although a Response was submitted pursuant to the provisions of 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 on May 19, 2005, this Response did not make any changes or additions to the claims.

V. SUMMARY OF CLAIMED SUBJECT MATTER

Independent claims 1, 7, 10, 12, 18, 20, and 22 are respectively directed to methods, computer program products, and a network dispatcher for establishing a persistent relationship between a client and a selected one of a plurality of servers managed by a dispatcher. Referring to the page 8 of the specification, a session routing token can be inserted in a uniform resource locator (URL) request during an communications session between a client and a server. Consequently, a dispatching mechanism/dispatcher can route client requests for information to the server during the session based upon server-identifying information disposed in the token in the URL. Prior to routing the requests to the designated server, however, the token/routing information can be removed from the URL and stores such that an outbound filter can subsequently access the routing information.

In conjunction with the URL modification, a server-side cookie jar (i.e., server-side storage area) is used to store cookies (i.e., information regarding the persistent relationship and

the client) on behalf of a particular client. This releases the client or client-side proxies from the responsibility of storing the cookies.

VI. ISSUES TO BE REVIEWED ON APPEAL

1. Claims 1, 12, and 22 were rejected under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112;
2. Claims 7 and 18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness based upon Courts et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,076,108 (hereinafter Courts), in view of Bellemore et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,088,728 (hereinafter Bellemore);
3. Claims 8 and 19 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness based upon Courts in view of Bellemore and Colby et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,006,264 (hereinafter Colby);
4. Claims 10 and 20 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness based upon Kunzelman et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,041,357 (hereinafter Kunzelman), in view of Courts and Bellemore; and
5. Claims 11 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness based upon Kunzelman in view of Courts, Bellemore, and Colby.

VII. THE ARGUMENT

THE REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1, 12, AND 22 UNDER THE SECOND PARAGRAPH OF 35

U.S.C. § 112

For convenience of the Honorable Board in addressing the rejections, claims 12 and 22 stand or fall together with independent claim 1.

On page 3 of the Fourth Office Action dated April 12, 2006 (hereinafter Fourth Office Action), the Examiner asserted the following:

Claims 1, 12 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being incomplete for omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements, such omission amounting to a gap between the necessary structural connections. See MPEP § 2172.01.

The Examiner then proceeded to list four "structural cooperative relationships preceding the insertion of the token into the URL" that the Examiner asserted were omitted.

For ease of reference, M.P.E.P. § 2172.01 is reproduced below:

A claim which omits matter disclosed to be essential to the invention as described in the specification or in other statements of record may be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as not enabling. *In re Mayhew*, 527 F.2d 1229, 188 USPQ 356 (CCPA 1976). See also MPEP § 2164.08(c). Such essential matter may include missing elements, steps or necessary structural cooperative relationships of elements described by the applicant(s) as necessary to practice the invention.

In addition, a claim which fails to interrelate essential elements of the invention as defined by applicant(s) in the specification may be rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, for failure to point out and distinctly claim the invention. See *In re Venezia*, 530 F.2d 956, 189 USPQ 149 (CCPA 1976); *In re Collier*, 397 F.2d 1003, 158 USPQ 266 (CCPA 1968). >But see *Ex parte Nolden*, 149 USPQ 378, 380 (Bd. Pat. App. 1965) ("[I]t is not essential to a patentable combination that there be interdependency between the elements of the claimed device or that all the elements operate concurrently toward the desired result"); *Ex parte Huber*, 148 USPQ 447, 448-49 (Bd. Pat. App. 1965) (A claim does not necessarily fail to comply with 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph where the various elements do not function simultaneously, are not directly functionally related, do not directly intercooperate, and/or serve independent purposes.).<

At the outset, Appellants note that the case law referred to above generally applies to "kit" or "assembly" claims. Independent claims 1, 12, and 22, however, are respectively directed to a

method, a computer program product, and a network dispatcher, which on their face do not appear to be kit or assembly claims.

Moreover, as summarized in above-reproduced passages, the case law requires that the alleged omitted essential matter be identified by Appellants as "essential" within the "specification" or within "other statements of record." The Examiner, however, has failed to establish that the four features alleged by the Examiner to be omitted, have been identified, by Appellants, as being essential.

Furthermore, Appellants surmise that the Examiner has misinterpreted the enablement requirement of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112, as the Examiner appears to be requiring that the independent claims enable the invention. This requirement, however, is not consonant with the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112, which only requires that the specification describe how to make and use the invention.

For the reasons stated above, Appellants respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to establish a proper rejection under the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. § 112.

**THE REJECTION OF CLAIMS 7 AND 18 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 FOR OBVIOUSNESS BASED
UPON COURTS IN VIEW OF BELLEMORE**

For convenience of the Honorable Board in addressing the rejections, claim 18 stands or falls together with independent claim 7.

Appellants respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to discharge the initial burden of establishing a prima facie basis to deny patentability to the claimed invention under 35 U.S.C. § 103.¹ In rejecting a claim under 35 U.S.C. § 103, the Examiner is required to identify a source in the applied prior art for: (1) claim limitations; and (2) the motivation to combine references or modify a reference in the reasonable expectation of achieving a particular benefit.² In so doing, it is legally erroneous to ignore any claim limitation.³

Independent Claim 7

Appellants respectfully submit that the Examiner has improperly relied upon the applied prior art to teach certain of the claimed limitations; and thus, the Examiner has failed to establish that the applied prior art teaches or suggests all of the claim limitations.

On page 4 of the Fourth Office Action, the Examiner cited column 6, line 45 of Courts to teach if a session binding is old (i.e., the claimed "determining, at the network dispatching mechanism, if a session binding indicated by said routing token is old"). For ease of reference, column 6, lines 43-48 of Courts is reproduced below:

Engine manager 120 is the system element that receives requests from the broker 102, binds the request to an available render engine 122, delivers the request to a render engine 122, receives the results from the render engine 122, and delivers the results back to broker 102.

A review of this cited passage does not yield any teaching of a determination that a session binding, as indicated by a routing token, is old. Therefore, the Examiner has improperly asserted that Courts discloses the above-identified claimed limitation.

¹ In re Mayne, 104 F.3d 1339, 41 USPQ2d 1451 (Fed. Cir. 1997); In re Oetiker, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992).

² Smiths Industries Medical System v. Vital Signs Inc., 183 F.3d 1347, 51 USPQ2d 1415 (Fed. Cir. 1999).

³ Uniroval, Inc. v. Rudkin-Wiley Corp., 837 F.2d 1044, 5 USPQ2d 1434 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

On page 4 of the Fourth Office Action, the Examiner cited column 3, line 5-7 and column 6, line 4 of Courts to teach the claimed "forwarding, by said network dispatching mechanism, the request, including the URL, to the particular server." For ease of reference, column 3, lines 5-7 and column 5, line 66 through column 6, line 5 of Courts are reproduced below:

Interaction layer 12 can be responsible for enforcing security, managing sessions, and distributing request to the most available servers.

As shown in FIG. 2A, a load distribution unit 98 receives user URL requests, Load distribution unit 98 then distributes each URL request to one of a plurality of physical computer systems for processing. In one implementation, load distribution unit 98 can be a CISCO Front End Local Director which uses a "round robin" or "least connections" algorithm for routing requests.

Although Courts teaches distributing a URL request, the claimed limitation also recites that in addition to the request, the actual URL is also forwarded to the particular server. However, the Examiner has not established that Court explicitly or inherently (i.e., necessarily) teaches that the actual URL, which generates the request, is forwarded along with the request to the particular server. Therefore, the Examiner has improperly asserted that Courts teaches the claimed "forwarding, by said network dispatching mechanism, the request, including the URL, to the particular server" (emphasis added).

As already noted above, the Examiner has not establish that the request, including the URL, is forwarded to the particular server. With regard to the URL, independent claim 7 further recites:

removing, by said particular server, said valid routing information from the URL;

storing, by said particular server, said routing information removed from said valid routing token, where said valid routing information can be accessed subsequently by an outbound data stream filter during the processing of an outbound reply related to said request;

On pages 4 and 5 of the Fourth Office Action, the Examiner cited column 1, lines 48-53 of Courts to teach the above-identified limitations. For ease of reference column 1, lines 48-53 is reproduced below:

Session data representing a state of the user session is stored in memory in a global session server. Then, for each subsequent request associated with the user session, the subsequent request is received, and the session data is retrieved from the global session server.

Not only has the Examiner failed to establish that a request, including an URL, is forwarded to a server. The citation reproduced above also fails to teach that valid routing information is removed from the URL by the server. This citation within Courts also fails to teach that the routing information removed from the URL is stored and can be accessed subsequently by an outbound data stream filter during the processing of an outbound reply related to the request. Appellants also note that the Examiner has not clearly identified those elements within Courts being relied upon. For example, the Examiner has not identified the outbound data stream filter. In this regard, the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 also fails to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.104(c).⁴

In the first full paragraph on page 5 of the Fourth Office Action, the Examiner asserted that:

Court et al, does not teach of tokens and inserting, by said particular server, said session information into said request and accessing, by said particular server, a server-side storage location where session information regarding a session between the particular server and the end user device is stored. However, *Bellemore et al* teach the incorporation of session information in the queries received by the clients (column 4, lines 21-43, column 8 lines 6-38, column 12 lines 55-67, column 16 lines 10-66, column 17 lines 14-54) and server-side storage where information about the session and the user is stored (column 2 lines 2-50, column 6 line 47 - column 7 line 7,

⁴ 37 C.F.R. § 1.104(c) provides:

In rejecting claims for want of novelty or for obviousness, the examiner must cite the best references at his or her command. When a reference is complex or shows or describes inventions other than that claimed by the applicant, the particular part relied on must be designated as nearly as practicable. The pertinence of each reference, if not apparent, must be clearly explained and each rejected claim specified.

column 13, lines 43-64).

At the outset, Appellants note that the Examiner's citation of column 4, lines 21-43 is found in the "Summary of the Invention" portion of Bellmore and provides little guidance as to those features within Bellemore that the Examiner is relying upon to teach the claimed invention. Moreover, the Examiner has cited nearly two additional columns of text to allegedly teach "the incorporation of session information in the queries received by the clients." Notwithstanding that these passages within Bellemore do not teach or suggest the limitations not disclosed by Courts, the Examiner has not clearly identified the individual elements within Bellemore being relied upon, and thus, the rejection further fails to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.104(c).

Upon reviewing Bellemore, Appellants note that although Bellmore teaches the use of "an identifier designating the server to which the client desires to long in" (column 16, lines 24-25), Appellants are unable to discover any teaching or suggestion that the "identifier" taught by Bellemore is found in a URL so as to correspond to the claimed "determining, at the network dispatching mechanism, if said URL contains a valid routing token." Moreover, Appellants have been unable to discover any teaching or suggestion by Bellemore that a determination is made as to whether or not the "identifier" is valid. Since, as admitted by the Examiner, Court et al. does not teach of tokens and inserting, even if one having ordinary skill in the art were motivated to combine Bellemore with Courts, the claimed invention would not result because Bellmore and Courts, either alone or in combination, fail to teach the claimed "determining, at the network dispatching mechanism, if said URL contains a valid routing token."

Therefore, even if the applied prior art were combined in the manner suggested by the Examiner, the claimed invention would not result since the Examiner has not established that the

applied prior art teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in claim 7. Independent claim 18 includes similar limitations to those recited in claim 7 and is patentable over the applied prior art at least for the same reasons. Appellants, therefore, respectfully submit that the imposed rejection of claims 7 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness based upon Courts in view of Kunzelman and Smith is not viable.

**THE REJECTION OF CLAIMS 8 AND 19 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 FOR OBVIOUSNESS BASED
UPON COURTS IN VIEW OF BELLEMORE AND COLBY**

For convenience of the Honorable Board in addressing the rejections, claims 8 and 19 stand or fall together with independent claim 7.

Claims 8 and 19 respectively depend from independent claims 7 and 18, and Appellants incorporate herein the arguments previously advanced in traversing the imposed rejection of claims 7 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness based upon Courts in view of Bellemore. Specifically, even if the applied prior art were combined in the manner suggested by the Examiner, the claimed invention would not result since the Examiner has not established that the applied prior art teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in claims 7 and 18. The additional reference to Colby does not cure the deficiencies of the combination of Courts in view of Bellemore. Accordingly, the proposed combination of references would not yield the claimed invention. Appellants, therefore, respectfully submit that the imposed rejection of claims 8 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness based upon Courts in view of Bellemore and Colby is not viable.

**THE REJECTION OF CLAIMS 10 AND 20 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 FOR OBVIOUSNESS
BASED UPON KUNZELMAN IN VIEW OF COURTS AND BELLEMORE**

For convenience of the Honorable Board in addressing the rejections, claim 20 stands or falls together with independent claim 10.

Independent claim 10 recites "removing all cookies from said response information; storing said removed cookies in a predetermined server-side storage area." In the paragraph spanning pages 14 and 15 of the Final Office Action, the Examiner cited column 2, lines 55-57; column 5, lines 38-62; and column 6, lines 43-57 of Kunzelman to teach these limitations, among others. At the outset, Appellants note that the Examiner has not clearly identified those elements within Kunzelman being relied upon. In this regard, the Examiner's rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 fails to comply with 37 C.F.R. § 1.104(c).

Notwithstanding the ambiguity of the Examiner's assertions regarding Kunzelman, a review of the Examiner's citation fails to yield any teaching that all cookies are removed from response information and that these removed cookies are stored in a predetermined server-side storage area. Therefore, the Examiner has improperly asserted that Kunzelman discloses the above-identified claimed limitations.

Since the Examiner has not established that the applied prior art teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in claim 10, the proposed combination of references would not yield the claimed invention. Independent claim 20 includes similar limitations to those recited in claim 10 and is patentable over the applied prior art at least for the same reasons. Appellants, therefore,

respectfully submit that the imposed rejection of claims 10 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness based upon Kunzelman in view of Courts and Bellemore is not viable.

**THE REJECTION OF CLAIMS 11 AND 21 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103 FOR OBVIOUSNESS
BASED UPON KUNZELMAN IN VIEW OF COURTS, BELLEMORE, AND COLBY**

For convenience of the Honorable Board in addressing the rejections, claims 11 and 20 stand or fall together with independent claim 10.

Claims 11 and 21 respectively depend from independent claims 10 and 20, and Appellants incorporate herein the arguments previously advanced in traversing the imposed rejection of claims 10 and 20 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness based upon Kunzelman in view of Courts and Bellemore. Specifically, even if the applied prior art were combined in the manner suggested by the Examiner, the claimed invention would not result since the Examiner has not established that the applied prior art teaches all of the claimed limitations recited in claims 11 and 21. The additional reference to Colby does not cure the deficiencies of the combination of Kunzelman in view of Courts and Bellemore. Accordingly, the proposed combination of references would not yield the claimed invention. Appellants, therefore, respectfully submit that the imposed rejection of claims 11 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 for obviousness based upon Kunzelman in view of Courts, Bellemore, and Colby is not viable.

Conclusion

Based upon the foregoing, Appellants respectfully submit that the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 103, 112 are not factually or legally viable. Appellants, therefore, respectfully solicit the Honorable Board to reverse the Examiner's rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 103, 112.

Date: July 12, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Scott D. Paul

Scott D. Paul

Registration No. 42,984

Steven M. Greenberg

Registration No. 44,725

CUSTOMER NUMBER 46320

VIII. CLAIMS APPENDIX

1. A method of establishing a persistent relationship between an end user device and a server where the server is one of a plurality of servers managed by a dispatcher and the end user device accesses the server using a uniform resource locator (URL), the method comprising the steps of:

receiving at the dispatcher, a request for information from the end user device;
determining by the dispatcher, which of the plurality of servers to select for satisfying the request;

creating, at the selected server, a token comprising at least an identifier for the selected server, a date/time stamp, and a key, said key for accessing a server-side storage area for information regarding the persistent relationship and the end user device;

inserting the token into the URL; and,

sending, by the selected server to the client device, a response with the token inserted into the URL.

2. A method as claimed in claim 1 wherein said token is encoded using a modified Base64 encoding.

3. A method as claimed in claim 1 wherein said token has a checksum or hash verification field.

4. A method as claimed in claim 3 wherein said hash is a SHA-1 hash computed over

said identifier for said selected server, said date/time stamp, and said key.

5. A method as claimed in claim 3 wherein said checksum or hash is encoded using a modified Base64 encoding.

6. A method as claimed in claim 1 wherein said information regarding said persistent relationship is stored as a cookie on said server.

7. A method of routing a request by an end user device to a particular one of a plurality of redundant servers residing behind a network dispatching mechanism, said methods comprising the steps of:

receiving, at the network dispatching mechanism, a request for information indicated by a uniform resource locator (URL);

determining, at the network dispatching mechanism, if said URL contains a valid routing token;

if said URL contains a valid routing token, further determining, at the network dispatching mechanism, if a session binding indicated by said routing token is old;

if said URL contains a valid routing token and said routing token is not old, forwarding, by said network dispatching mechanism, the request, including the URL, to the particular server indicated by said valid routing token;

removing, by said particular server, said valid routing information from the URL;

storing, by said particular server, said routing information removed from said valid routing token, where said valid routing information can be accessed subsequently by an

outbound data stream filter during the processing of an outbound reply related to said request;

accessing, by said particular server, a server-side storage location where session information regarding a session between the particular server and the end user device is stored; and,

inserting, by said particular server, said accessed session information into said request.

8. A method as claimed in claim 7 wherein additional filtering of the URL is done prior to the forwarding step.

9. A method as claimed in claim 1 wherein all filtering is performed within the dispatcher.

10. A method of sending information to a requesting end user from an application over a session wherein said application resides at one of a plurality of redundant servers residing behind a network dispatcher, said method comprising the steps of:

receiving response information from said application, said response information including a URL (uniform resource locator);

determining if a server-side key cookie has been used for storing session information between said end user and said application;

if a server-side key cookie has been used for storing session information, retrieving a session key from said key cookie;

if a key cookie was not used for storing session information, retrieving said session key from a control block;

- removing all cookies from said response information;
- storing said removed cookies in a predetermined server-side storage area;
- updating said URL to indicate the removal of said cookies;
- creating a sticky routing string;
- updating a date/time stamp in said sticky routing string;
- inserting said sticky routing string into said URL; and,
- transmitting said response information, including said URL to said end user.

11. A method as claimed in claim 10 wherein, prior to said determining step, said response information is transmitted from said application through one or more filters.

12. A computer program product having computer readable code means of establishing a persistent relationship between an end user device and a server where the server is one of a plurality of servers managed by a dispatcher and the end user device accesses the server using a uniform resource locator (URL), the computer program product comprising:

- computer readable code means of receiving at the dispatcher, a request for information from the end user device;

- computer readable code means of determining by the dispatcher, which of the plurality of servers to select for satisfying the request;

- computer readable code means of creating, at the selected server, a token comprising at least an identifier for the selected server, a data/time stamp, and a key, said key for accessing a server-side storage area for information regarding the persistent relationship and the end user device;

computer readable code means of inserting the token into the URL; and,

computer readable code means of sending, by the selected server to the client device, a response with the token inserted into the URL.

13. A computer program product as claimed in claim 12 wherein said token is encoded using a modified Base64 encoding.

14. A computer program product as claimed in claim 12 wherein said token has a checksum or hash verification field.

15. A computer program product as claimed in claim 14 wherein said hash is a SHA-1 hash computed over said identifier for said selected server, said date/time stamp, and said key.

16. A computer program product as claimed in claim 14 wherein said checksum or hash is encoded using a modified Base64 encoding.

17. A computer program product as claimed in claim 12 wherein said information regarding said persistent relationship is stored as a cookie on said server.

18. A computer program product having computer readable code means for routing a request by an end user device to a particular one of a plurality of redundant servers residing behind a network dispatching mechanism, said computer program product comprising:

computer readable program code for receiving, at the network dispatching mechanism, a

request for information indicated by a uniform resource locator (URL);

computer readable program code for determining, at the network dispatching mechanism, if said URL contains a valid routing token;

if said URL contains a valid routing token, computer readable program code for further determining, at the network dispatching mechanism, if a session binding indicated by said routing token is old;

if said URL contains a valid routing token and said routing token is not old, computer readable program code for forwarding, by said network dispatching mechanism, the request, including the URL, to the particular server indicated by said valid routing token;

computer readable program code for removing, by said particular server, said valid routing information from the URL;

computer readable program code for storing, by said particular server, said routing information removed from said valid routing token, where said valid routing information can be accessed subsequently by an outbound data stream filter during the processing of an outbound reply related to said request;

computer readable program code for accessing, by said particular server, a server-side storage location where session information regarding a session between the particular server and the end user device is stored; and,

computer readable program code for inserting, by said particular server, said accessed session information into said request.

19. The computer program product as claimed in claim 18 wherein additional filtering of the URL is done prior to the forwarding step.

20. A computer program product having computer readable code means of sending information to a requesting end user from an application over a session wherein said application resides at one of a plurality of redundant servers residing behind a network dispatcher, said computer program product comprising:

computer readable programming means of receiving response information from said application, said response information including a URL (uniform resource locator);

computer readable programming means of determining if a server-side key cookie has been used for storing session information between said end user and said application;

if a server-side key cookie has been used for storing session information, computer readable programming means of retrieving a session key from said key cookie;

if a key cookie was not used for storing session information, computer readable programming means of retrieving said session key from a control block;

computer readable programming means of removing all cookies from said response information;

computer readable programming means of storing said removed cookies in a predetermined server-side storage area;

computer readable programming means of updating said URL to indicate the removal of said cookies;

computer readable programming means of creating a sticky routing string;

computer readable programming means of updating a date/time stamp in said sticky routing string;

computer readable programming means of inserting said sticky routing string into said

URL; and,

computer readable programming means of transmitting said response information, including said URL to said end user.

21. A computer program product as claimed in claim 20 wherein, prior to said determining step, said response information is transmitted from said application through one or more filters.

22. A network dispatcher for establishing a persistent relationship between an end user device and a server where the server is one of a plurality of servers managed by said network dispatcher comprising:

means for receiving a request for information from said end user device, said request for information including a uniform resource locator (URL);

means for determining which of the plurality of servers to select for satisfying said request for information;

means for creating, at said selected server, a token comprising at least an identifier for the selected server, a date/time stamp, and a key, said key for accessing a server-side storage area for information regarding the persistent relationship and the end user device;

means for inserting the token into the URL; and,

means for sending, by the selected server, a response with the token inserted into the URL to the client device.

23. A network dispatcher as claimed in claim 22 wherein said token is encoded using a

modified Base64 encoding.

24. A network dispatcher as claimed in claim 22 wherein said token has a checksum or hash verification field.

25. A network dispatcher as claimed in claim 24 wherein said hash is a SHA-1 has computed over said identifier for said selected server, said date/time stamp, and said key.

26. A network dispatcher as claimed in claim 24 wherein said checksum or hash is encoded using a modified Base64 encoding.

27. A network dispatcher as claimed in claim 22 wherein said information regarding the persistent relationship is stored as a cookie on said server.

IX. EVIDENCE APPENDIX

No evidence submitted pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.130, 1.131, or 1.132 of this title or of any other evidence entered by the Examiner has been relied upon by Appellants in this Appeal, and thus no evidence is attached hereto.

X. RELATED PROCEEDINGS APPENDIX

Since Appellants are unaware of any related appeals and interferences, no decision rendered by a court or the Board is attached hereto.